

#### REMARKS

The Title has been changed such that it is more descriptive of the claimed invention.

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, claims 12-14, 16, 18-20 and 22 have been cancelled, while claim 15 has been made an independent claim and includes the limitations of cancelled claim 12; claim 17 has been made an independent claim and includes the limitations of cancelled claims 12 and 16; claim 21 has been made an independent claim and includes the limitations of cancelled claim 18; and claim 23 has been made an independent claim and includes the limitations of cancelled claims 18 and 22. In addition, claim 24 has been amended such that it now depends from claim 15.

The Examiner has rejected claims 12, 18 and 24 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over (1) claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10 and 11 of U.S. Patent 6,693,864, and (2) claims 1, 3, 4 and 7-9 of U.S. Patent 6,600,709. The Examiner has further rejected claims 12-14, 16, 18-20, 22 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,280,810 to Nakamura et al. In addition, the Examiner has rejected claims 12-14, 16, 18-20 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,109,373 to Ohno et al. Applicant acknowledges that the Examiner has found claims 15, 17, 21 and 23 allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above changes, Applicant believes that the Examiner's rejections have been overcome.

Applicant believes that this application, containing claims 15, 17, 21, 23 and 24, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by           /Edward W. Goodman/            
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613  
Attorney  
Tel.: 914-333-9611